

NEKI PRILOZI ZA BOLJE RAZUMIJEVANJE I UŽIVANJE U FILMU PLASTIČNI ISUS LAZARA STOJANOVIĆA

IF I WEAVE AROUND AT NIGHT/AND POLICEMAN THINK I'M TIGHT THEY NEVER
FIND MY BOTTLE, THOUGH THEY ASK/PLASTIC JESUS SHELTERS ME FOR THIS
HEAD COMES OFF, YOU SEE/ HE'S HOLLOW, AND I USE HIM FOR A FLASK.
G. CROMARTY & E. RUSH, *PLASTIC JESUS*, 1957.



IF I WEAVE AROUND AT NIGHT/AND POLICEMAN THINK I'M TIGHT THEY NEVER
FIND MY BOTTLE, THOUGH THEY ASK/PLASTIC JESUS SHELTERS ME FOR THIS
HEAD COMES OFF, YOU SEE/ HE'S HOLLOW, AND I USE HIM FOR A FLASK.
G. CROMARTY & E. RUSH, *PLASTIC JESUS*, 1957.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO A BETTER APPREHENSION AND APPRECIATION OF PLASTIC JESUS BY LAZAR STOJANOVIĆ

1. Politika

Priča o Plastičnom Isusu više je priča o politici nego o filmu. Bogdan Tirnanić piše da je taj film uspio svrstati bivšu Jugoslaviju među 'velike kinematografije' jer jedino su u SAD-u i Sovjetskom Savezu – ali i u Turskoj! – filmski redatelji robijali zbog svojih ostvarenja.¹ Tirnanić u svojoj revizionističkoj interpretaciji 'crnog vala', pored miroljubivog i ciničnog antijugoslavenstva, također ističe da su glavni razlog njegova neuspjeha mračne (čaršijsko-esnafsko-dućandžijske) sile, koje nisu dopustile da se ovaj fenomen u filmu razvije do svoje cjelokupne urbane modernosti (legendarnosti?!). Ove mračne sile Tirnanić je najslikovitije objasnio u svojoj apokaliptičnoj viziji Beograda bez kina: "tada više ništa neće stajati na putu novim osvajačima Beograda, čije se zurle i tarabuci čuju iz predgrađa, odakle se k centru valja plima etnografskog đubreta koja preti da nas sve podavi uz minaretsko zavijanje došlo iz tame s tovarom mržnje prema tajni koja je ovde zanavek skrivena".² Ta tajna Beograda jest tajna koju on, uz ostalo, afirmira i u skrivenoj povijesti crnog vala; ona je, kao što se može pretpostaviti, moderna, urbana, kulturna, svjetska, kritična, liberalna, otvorena, civilizirana, itd. Zbog toga u navedenoj knjizi Tirnanić nije u stanju prihvatiti da je zapravo veći dio te 'urbane i građanske' kulture Beograda bio jedan od bitnih

SEZGIN
BOYNIK

1. Politics

The story of *Plastic Jesus* is a story of politics rather than film. Bogdan Tirnanić has once written that this film managed to bring ex-Yugoslavia among the 'great cinematographies', for it is only in the USA and the USSR – but also in Turkey! – that film directors have gone to prison for their achievements.¹ In his revisionist interpretation of the 'Black Wave', Tirnanić mentions its benign and cynical anti-Yugoslav sentiments, but also emphasizes that the main reason for its failure in the shape of dark (provincial/parochial/clan-like) forces, which could not allow that this cinematic phenomenon should evolve to its full urban modernity (status of a legend?!). These dark forces have been most vividly described by Tirnanić in his apocalyptic vision of Belgrade without cinemas: "Then nothing will stand in the way of the new conquerors of Belgrade, whose zurlas and tarabucs can be heard from the suburbs, from which a tide of ethnographic trash is rolling towards the city centre, threatening to drown us all to the sound of howling minarets, coming from the dark with a load of hatred to seize the secret that is hidden here forever."² That secret of Belgrade is a secret that he has, among other things, asserted in the secret history of the Black Wave; as we can only presuppose, it is modern, urban, cultured, worldly, critical, liberal, open-minded,

uzroka rata koji se događa “svega stotinjak kilometara dalje”.³ Uspostavlja se logična veza između njegova “srbijskog turcizma” – “ali i [onog] u Turskoj” – i mentaliteta koji on prihvata kao dominantan u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji, koja se interpretira kao neka vrsta ‘staljinizma’ ili ‘totalitarizma’.

Lazar Stojanović, režiser *Plastičnog Isusa*, tri je godine, od 1972. do 1975., bio u zatvoru zbog svog filma koji prije toga nije bio čak ni javno prikazan. Stojanović, jedan od urednika časopisa *Vidici* i *Studenti* krajem 60-ih, 1971. godine završio je film *Plastični Isus* kao završni diplomski rad kod Aleksandra Petrovića na Fakultetu dramskih umetnosti u Beogradu. Odmah nakon što je od Petrovića dobio najveću ocjenu, a prije nego je načinio konačnu verziju filma, otišao je služiti vojsku. Nakon nekog incidenta, kad je otvoreno kritizirao vojsku, iznoseći kako je godinu dana za vrijeme služenja vojnog roka bio maltretiran na najrazličitije načine, priveden je na saslušanje i osuđen od strane vrhovnog suda na tri godine teške robije.

Plastični Isus mnogo je puta poslužio kao lakmus-papir jugoslavenskog demokratizma, a mnogi ga smatraju filmom kojim se država poslužila kako bi konačno likvidirala ‘crni val’. Kao što Dušan Makavejev primjećuje, to je očito čak i u Dedijerovoj *Istoriji Jugoslavije*: tumačeći povijest Jugoslavije, Dedijer kao ključne događaje iz 1971. i 1972. navodi sljedeće:

napadi na Latinku i Nikezića; Koča Popović daje ostavku; Nikezić i Latinka daju ostavke; Lazar Stojanović uhićen; Danilo Udovički također; Saša Petrović i Dušan Makavejev napuštaju zemlju...⁴ Ovdje je razvidno da je uzrok zabrane ‘crnog vala’ više političkog nego estetskog karaktera. Kao što je svima koji pročitaju ove Dedijerove bilješke jasno, *crni val* (a prije svega “crni” film *par excellence* – *Plastični Isus*) bio je kolateralna šteta “čistke” navedenih srpskih liberala iz 1972. godine.

Jasna Dragović-Soso, koja u svojoj knjizi istražuje ulogu i utjecaj intelektualaca na preporod nacionalizma u poslijeratnoj Jugoslaviji, primjećuje istu tu vezu između srpskih liberala i crnog vala. Prema njoj, *crni val* i *praksisovci* uvijek su bili meta svake vrste blage cenzure i autocenzure, “ali do najsnažnijeg suzbijanja crnog talasa i nove ljevice došlo je onda kada su se njihovim kritičarima pridružile nove, rastuće snage osporavanja: nacionalizma i liberalizma”.⁵ Ove snage osporavanja su, gotovo istodobno, postale vidljive u Hrvatskoj i Srbiji krajem 60-ih i početkom 70-ih godina. U Hrvatskoj se prva struja, koja je započela kao jezično samoopredjeljenje, razvila do prijedloga za otcjepljenjem od Jugoslavije. U isto vrijeme su se u Srbiji struje osporavanja, također započete s diskursom o lingvističkim i književnim elementima, razvile do točke u kojoj se problematizirao

civilized, etc. For that reason, Tirnanić has been unable to accept in his book that, actually, most of that ‘urban and civic’ culture of Belgrade was among the crucial causes of the war that was taking place “only a hundred kilometres away”.³ A logical link is established between his “Serbian Turkism” – “but also [the one] in Turkey” – and the mentality that he has acknowledged as dominant in socialist Yugoslavia, which is interpreted as a sort of ‘Stalinism’ or ‘totalitarianism’. Lazar Stojanović, the director of *Plastic Jesus*, spent three years in prison (1972-1975) because of his film, even though it had not even been publicly shown. Stojanović was one of the editors of journals *Vidici* and *Studenti* in the late 1960s and in 1971 he finished his *Plastic Jesus* as his graduation project the Faculty of Drama Arts in Belgrade, with Aleksandar Petrović as his mentor. Immediately after his film received the highest note by professor Petrović and before he could produce the final version, he was called up for military duty. After an incident in which he publicly criticized the army, claiming that he had been abused in most various ways during that one year of army service, he was arrested for investigation and eventually sentenced to three years of hard labour by the Supreme Court. *Plastic Jesus* has often been used as the litmus-paper of Yugoslav democracy and many have considered it the film that

the state used for the final liquidation of the ‘Black Wave’. As Dušan Makavejev has observed, it was quite obvious even in Dedijer’s *History of Yugoslavia*: while interpreting Yugoslav history, Dedijer mentioned the following key events from 1971 and 1972: assaults on Latinka and Nikezić; resignation of Koča Popović; resignation of Nikezić and Latinka; arrest of Lazar Stojanović; arrest of Danilo Udovički; exile of Saša Petrović and Dušan Makavejev...⁴ It is evident that the reason for banning the ‘Black Wave’ was political rather than aesthetical in nature. As it must become clear to all who have read these notes of Dedijer’s, the Black Wave (and above all the “black” film *par excellence* – *Plastic Jesus*) was a collateral damage of “cleansing” the above-mentioned Serbian liberals in 1972.

Jasna Dragović-Soso, who has investigated the role and the influence of intellectuals in the resurgence of nationalism in post-war Yugoslavia, noticed the same connection between Serbian liberals and the Black Wave. According to her, the Black Wave and *Praxis* were the regular target of all sorts of mild censorship and self-censorship, “but the strongest suppression of the Black Wave and the New Left occurred when their critics were joined by the new emerging forces of opposition: nationalism and liberalism.”⁵ These forces of opposition became evident in Croatia and Serbia almost at

položaj Srba u republikama izvan Srbije, budućnost Federacije i decentralizacije. Ova nacionalna struja, koju je predvodio Dobrica Ćosić s Udruženjem književnika, uspjela je mobilizirati toliki broj intelektualaca da su se među njihovim skupovima često nalazili i praksisovci, liberali, nova ljevica itd. Soso u svojoj analizi ne daje jasno do znanja koje su razlike i veze između "dvije snage osporavanja" - nacionalizma i liberalizma, a nije razvidno ni na koji je način došlo do toga da su se ove dvije snage pridružile kritikama *crnog vala* i *nove ljevice* (je li to bilo zbog toga što su sve ove pojave imale nešto zajedničko, primjerice "slobodno tržište" ili slobodni srpski građanski duh, ili mu je zajedničko to što je državni aparat sva ova osporavanja (nova ljevica, crni val, liberalizam i nacionalizam) ugušio u isto vrijeme. Sigurno je da autorica prihvaća ovo posljednje tumačenje samim time što konstatira da je pad srpskog "liberalnog" partijskog rukovodstva označio početak još surovije represije. Godine 1973. mladi filmski redatelj Lazar Stojanović osuđen je na godinu i pol dana zatvora zbog svog diplomskog rada, filma pod nazivom *Plastični Isus*, u kojem je upotrijebio dokumentarni materijal iz filmskih reportaža o Hitleru, Staljinu i Titu, i to na način koji je navodno "izjednačio vrijednost fašizma i socijalizma".⁶ Iako mi na ovom mjestu nije moguće upustiti se u analizu

sličnosti između nacionalista i liberala, treba reći da se poglavlje u knjizi koje Soso počinje s Lazarom Stojanovićem nastavlja sa "slobodnim univerzitetom", "obranom građanskih prava", samizdat-akcijama, partizanstvom liberalaca ("teškoće u uspostavljanju međurepubličkih aktivnosti bile su uglavnom rezultat kontrole međusobnog komuniciranja intelektualaca na crnoj listi u različitim republikama...pa su se [veze] isključivo oslanjale na ljude koji su putovali od jednog grada do drugog", str. 89), s Gojkom Ćogom, a završava se s Vojislavom Šešeljom. Pjesnik Gojko Ćogo bio je tijekom osamdesetih poznat kao simbol borbe za ljudska prava i slobodu izraza, jer su njegove pjesme, u kojima je kritizirao Tita, bile glavni sudski predmet koji je pokrenuo lavinu diskusija o totalitarizmu Jugoslavije i velikoj antisrpskoj zavjeri. Nimalo ne čudi što je on, početkom devedesetih, bio na čelu udruženja koje je pomagalo ratne napore bosanskih Srba. Istih je godina Lazar Stojanović s Paulom Pawlowskijem napravio svoju *Srpsku epiku*, gdje je pokazao "da je sada (1994.) fizički opasnije i u mnogo kom pogledu teže boriti se protiv režima s kojim se ne slažete, iako neki mehanizmi, koji garantiraju slobodu govora i okupljanja, stvaraju iluziju da je sada lakše".⁷ Zbog svih navedenih razloga politička je strana filma *Plastični Isus* problematična; ona se na pogrešan način

SEZGIN

BOYNIK

the same time: in the late 60s and early 70s. In Croatia, the first current was formed by linguistic self-identification and evolved to suggest separation from Yugoslavia. At the same time, Serbian forces of opposition, likewise born in linguistic and literary discourse, evolved to the point of questioning the position of Serbs in other Yugoslav republics, the future of the Federation, and the possibility of decentralization. That nationalist current, led by Dobrica Ćosić and the Association of Literary Writers, managed to mobilize such numbers of intellectuals that their meetings often included even the members of Praxis, liberals, the New Left, etc. In her analysis, Soso has failed to present clearly the differences and links between those "two forces of opposition" – nationalism and liberalism – and it remains equally unclear how it occurred that they both joined the critics of the Black Wave and the New Left (perhaps because all these phenomena had something in common, such as the "free market" or free Serbian civic spirit, or perhaps because the state apparatus suppressed all these oppositions (the New Left, the Black Wave, liberalism, and nationalism) at the same time. Soso obviously accepts this last interpretation, since she claims that the fall of Serbian "liberal" party leadership marked the beginning of an even more brutal repression. In 1973, the young film director Lazar Stojanović was senten-

ced to a year and half of prison for his graduation project, a film entitled *Plastic Jesus*, in which he used documentary video material on Hitler, Stalin, and Tito, in such a way that he was accused of "presenting fascism and socialism as equivalent."⁶

Even though I cannot enter here into an analysis of similarities between nationalists and liberals, one should say that the chapter of Soso's book that begins with Lazar Stojanović continues with the "free university," "defence of human rights," *samizdat*-actions, guerrilla-like activities of the liberals ("the difficulties in establishing inter-republic activities were largely a result of control over the communication of intellectuals that were on the black list in various republics... so that they relied exclusively on individuals that travelled between the cities"), and Gojko Ćogo, and ends with Vojislav Šešelj. Poet Gojko Ćogo was famous in the 80s as the symbol of struggle for human rights and freedom of expression, since his poems, in which he criticized Tito, provoked a court trial that started an avalanche of debates on totalitarianism in Yugoslavia and the great anti-Serbian complot. It is no wonder that, in the early 90s, he was presiding over an association that supported the bellicose efforts of Bosnian Serbs. At the same time, Lazar Stojanović completed his *Serbian Epic* with Paul Pawlowski, in which he showed that "now (in 1994)

može upotrijebiti kao alibi za "totalitarizam" Jugoslavije, može okarakterizirati (i karikaturalno prikazati) položaj "slobodoumnih" intelektualaca do točke nacionalnog herojskog ponosa te može poslužiti građanskoj svijesti da uživa u pleonazmu nacionalnog liberalizma i liberalnog nacionalizma.

Kao što je Dušan Makavejev jednom rekao: "Umjetnost ne može da se šutira politički. Jer ko god proba da je politički šutne, slomiće nogu. I ko god je to uradio, slomio je nogu."⁸

2. Film

Lazar Stojanović je jednom rekao da "za mnoge filmove, kada ih gledate danas, nije jasno zbog čega su zabranjeni". U istom razgovoru Stojanović također ističe da je vrlo sretan što se njegov film interpretira više kao umjetnički proizvod, nego samo kao neki politički kuriozitet. Pitanje je kako danas možemo gledati na *Plastičnog Isusa*? Prva stvar koju je potrebno rasvijetliti u vezi s jugoslavenskom kinematografijom, osim toga da je ona uvijek bila napuhani balon neke vrste holivudskog spektakla, jest to da njezin alternativni segment, koji se karakterizira kao *crni val*, gotovo nikad nije imao nikakvog kulturnog i estetskog učinka, čak ni u vrijeme svoje produkcije. Gotovo nijedan film *crnog vala*, osim nekih filmova Živojina Pavlovića i Aleksandra Petrovića,

nije bio masovno gledan u kinima, a neke filmove Jovana Jovanovića ili *Plastičnog Isusa* Lazara Stojanovića do prije petnaestak godina gotovo nitko nije ni gledao. Paradoksalno, može se reći da *Plastični Isus* jest film postjugoslavenske generacije; jednako kao što Boris Buden kaže da je *WR: Misterije Organizma* film o postsocijalizmu, tako i mi možemo reći da su mnogi filmovi crnog vala (pogotovo *Plastični Isus*) upućeni (nama) post-Jugoslavenima, iz jednog vrlo praktičnog razloga – jer u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji nitko zapravo nije gledao te filmove.¹⁰

Plastičnog Isusa možemo smatrati povijesnim filmom. Najprihvaćenija interpretacija je ona koja kaže da se film bavi studentskim pokretima iz 1968. godine. Pavle Levi, koji interpretira *crni val* kao neku vrstu kinematografskog zapisa praksisovske "nove ljevice", također prihvaća tezu da je humanitarni socijalizam praksisovaca, koji je nekako doveo i do studentskog bunta 1968., izvršio priličan utjecaj i na režisere *crnog vala* u smislu njihove formulacije o koherenciji između teorije i prakse samoupravljanja, kritike kulta ličnosti personificiranog u liku Tita, afirmacije individualnosti i, naravno, nealijeniranog humanističkog socijalizma.¹¹ Sve je to imalo veze s 1968.

Studentski bunt 1968. bio je tema mnogih 'crnih' filmova, od arhivskih snimaka u *Plastičnom Isusu* do filmova Želimira

NEKI PRILOZI
ZA BOLJE
RAZUMIJEVANJE
I UŽIVANJE U
FILMU PLASTIČNI
ISUS LAZARA
STOJANOVIĆA

CONTRIBUTIONS
TO A BETTER
APPREHENSION
AND APPRECIATION
OF PLASTIC
JESUS BY LAZAR
STOJANOVIĆ

it is physically more dangerous and in many respects more difficult to fight against the regime with which you disagree, even though certain mechanisms, which guarantee the freedom of speech and association, create the illusion that it is easier."⁷

For all these reasons, the political side of *Plastic Jesus* remains problematic; it can be erroneously used as an alibi for "totalitarianism" in Yugoslavia, characterize (and caricaturize) the position of "free-minded" intellectuals to the point of national heroic pride, or serve the civic awareness in enjoying the pleonasm of national liberalism and liberal nationalism. As Dušan Makavejev has once said, "Art cannot be kicked around politically, and whoever tries to do it will break his leg. And whoever has ever done it broke his leg."⁸

2. Film

Lazar Stojanović has once said that "for many films, if you see them today, you can hardly understand why they were forbidden in their time."⁹ In the same interview, he emphasized that he was very happy that his film was interpreted as a work of art rather than a political curiosity. The question is: How can we understand *Plastic Jesus* today? The first thing that needs clarification as to Yugoslav cinematography, apart from the fact that it was always an inflated balloon of

some sort of Hollywood-like spectacle, is that its alternative segment, characterized as the Black Wave, almost never attained any cultural or aesthetical influence, not even at the time of its production. Almost no film belonging to the Black Wave, apart from some by Živojin Pavlović and Aleksandar Petrović, was ever seen by masses of people, while some films by Jovan Jovanović or *Plastic Jesus* by Lazar Stojanović were seen by almost nobody until some fifteen years ago. Paradoxically, one may say that *Plastic Jesus* is indeed typical of the post-Yugoslav generation; just as Boris Buden has stated that *WR: The Mysteries of Organism* was about post-socialism, we can say that many films belonging to the Black Wave (especially *Plastic Jesus*) are addressing (us) post-Yugoslavs, and we will have a very tangible argument – namely, that in socialist Yugoslavia nobody was really watching these films.¹⁰

Plastic Jesus can be regarded a historical film. The most accepted interpretation is that which says that it is about the student movements of 1968. Pavle Levi, who has interpreted the Black Wave as a sort of cinematographic document on *Praxis's* "New Left", also accepts the thesis that the humanist socialism of *Praxis*, which somehow led to the student demonstrations of 1968, exerted a considerable influence on Black Wave directors, namely in the way in which they

Žilnika *Rani radovi i Lipanjska gibanja*, preko filmova Jovana Jovanovića, do Petrovićeva *Biće skoro propast sveta* ("Kad mogu studenti možemo i mi"). Jedan od najboljih trenutaka u filmu *Plastični Isus* jest kolaž-intervencija u famozni Titov govor koji je uslijedio odmah nakon studentskih demonstracija. Stojanović je uspio iz televizijskog arhiva pronaći filmsku vrpču na kojoj se vidi kako se Tito priprema za svoj povijesni govor o tome kako su studenti bili u pravu, te da su upravo oni izrazili nespremnost samoupravnog jugoslavenskog sistema na samokritiku, na što se i on sam žalio. No prije nego što će početi govoriti, po prvi put vidimo lidera tako nesigurnog, kako koju minutu ili dvije prije nastupa nervozno i šutke samo prelistava svoj pisani govor. Scena koja prati Titovu nijemu nervozu detalj je iz neke televizijske kič-serije u kojoj se odvija sljedeći dijalog između muškarca i žene: "To je tvoja posljednja riječ? – Nije mu bilo lako priznati svoj poraz!" Ovo je jedina scena u čitavom crnom valu u kojoj se jedan film tako otvoreno bavi maršalom Titom. Makavejev je, na primjer, u svim svojim filmovima najviše pazio da se ne referira direktno na Tita.¹² Titov govor nakon ove *détournement*-intervencije s kičom ilustrira njegovu odluku o budućnosti studentskog pokreta: "Mi smo došli u konflikt s mladom generacijom, a ja kažem da upravo oni nastavljaju revoluciju." Ovaj Titov govor, kako

primjećuje Branislav Jakovljević, studenti su protumačili kao svoju pobjedu, iako gotovo nijedan njihov zahtjev nije ispunjen. Iako je, dakle, štrajk završen te iste večeri, a ponegdje se i slavilo, to je, međutim, bio samo radostan početak užasnog kraja.¹³

Prema Jakovljeviću, studentski pokret započeo je kada je četrdesetak policajaca s pendrecima i vodenim topovima zabranilo studentima ulazak u zgradu u kojoj su se zabavljali akcijaši – zbog toga pokret nikad nije imao stvarnu definiranu ideologiju, nego je bio nekakva potraga za "dobrim vremenom", za uživanjem. On ovu svoju teoriju potkrepljuje kritikom Edgara Morina pariške 1968. kao "skoro revolucije" teatralnosti. Dokaz za to je teatralni monolog glumca Steve Žigona pročitani u dvorištu Filozofskog fakulteta u danima studentskog bunta, koji je bio jedan od najvažnijih dramatičnih trenutaka cijelog pokreta (čiji original možemo vidjeti i u *Lipanskim gibanjima* Želimira Žilnika, a reminiscenciju u *Kako sam sistematski uništen od idiota* Slobodana Šijana), uz činjenicu da se premijerno izvođenje rock-mjuzikla *Kosa* u Beogradu gotovo podudarilo s prvom godišnjicom izbijanja studentskog protesta. "*Kosa* u Beogradu igra samo mesec dana nakon Njujorka, Londona, Stockholma i Minhena, a dve nedelje pre premijere u Parizu."¹⁴ Epizoda ove euforije nastavlja se kada režiseri *Kose* pridruže

SEZGIN

BOYNIK

formulated the coherence between the theory and practice of self-management, criticized the personality cult as embodied in Tito, emphasized individuality, and, of course, endorsed unallied humanistic socialism.¹¹ All that was related to 1968.

The student protests of 1968 were the topic of many 'black' films, from archival video recordings in *Plastic Jesus* to films by Želimir Žilnik (*Early Works* and *June Movements*), to Jovan Jovanović and Petrović's *Soon the End of the World Will Come* ("If the students can do it, we can do it"). One of the best moments in *Plastic Jesus* is a collage-intervention into the famous speech that Tito held immediately after the student demonstrations. Stojanović managed to obtain from the TV-archives a video tape showing Tito while preparing for his historic speech on how the students were right and how it was them that were expressing the unwillingness of self-managed Yugoslav system to engage in self-criticism, of which he had complained himself. However, before starting his speech, the leader shows himself uncertain for the first time, fingering through his papers nervously and silently a minute or two before the event. The scene following Tito's mute nervousness is a detail from some tacky TV-series, bringing the following dialogue between a man and a woman: "Is that your last word? – It was not easy for him to

admit his defeat!" This is the only scene in the entire Black Wave that deals so openly with Marshall Tito. Makavejev, for example, took great care in all his films not to make any direct reference to the president.¹² Tito's speech after this *détournement*-intervention with the help of kitsch illustrates his decision about the future of the student movement: "We have come into conflict with the young generation, but I am telling you, it is precisely them who will continue the revolution." This speech of Tito's, as suggested by Branislav Jakovljević, was interpreted by the students as their victory, even though almost none of their demands was fulfilled. Even though the strike ended that very evening, and there was even some celebration, it was just the joyful beginning of a terrible end.¹³

According to Jakovljević, the student movement began when forty policemen with batons and water-cannons prevented the students from entering the building where some activists were having fun – that is why the movement never had a clearly defined ideology, but remained a sort of quest for the "good times", for joy. Jakovljević sustained his hypothesis with Edgar Morin's criticism of 1968 in Paris as the "almost-revolution" of theatricality. The proof may be the theatrical monologue of actor Stevo Žigon, which he read in the courtyard of the Faculty of Philosophy at the

beogradskom buntovničkom karavanu "demonstracije, ljubavi, svade i nade" i kada glumci interpretiraju *Let the Sunshine In* specijalno za Tita prigodom proslave Nove godine u Domu omladine 1970. Ovako gledano, Studentski pokret 1968. godine izgleda kao rekuperacija revolucionarne i buntovničke geste nezadovoljne omladine. Ona je igra-revolucija, ili kako Rastko Močnik primjećuje o *Ranim radovima*: "To je kraj revolucije pre nego što je ona počela."¹⁵ Lako je sada doći do zaključka da je studentski pokret bio ventil društvenog (i libidalnog) nezadovoljstva i da je ta hipijevska "fikcija besprekorne i čiste pozitivnosti, o devičanskoj zemlji s onu stranu ideologije, politički gledano najopasnija pozicija".¹⁶ Vasiljević, koji na vrlo uvjerljiv način pokazuje konzumerske i populističke strane studenskog bunta i njegove supra-ideologije, u svojoj tezi čini nejasnu razliku između dvije vrste ideologije kada kaže: "U slučaju bivše Jugoslavije, pokušaj da se pronade ta slepa mrlja ideologije završio je sa ideološkim slepilom", što znači da ideologija koja igra regulativnu i konstitutivnu glavnu ulogu cijelog sistema može u isto vrijeme biti neka vrsta loše shvaćenog puta, ili vica. Nažalost uvijek, kao što već znamo, apropijacija Žižekovih teza (naročito one o "metastazi uživanja") dovodi do političkog cinizma u zaključcima. Dodajući ovome i cijelu konfuziju oko interpretacije 1968.

NEKI PRILOGI
ZA BOLJE
RAZUMIJEVANJE
I UŽIVANJE U
FILMU PLASTIČNI
ISUS LAZARA
STOJANOVIĆA

koju on izaziva tako što bez ikakva ustručavanja spaja i u zajedničkom kontekstu upotrebljava teoriju Edgara Morina i Guy Deborda, koji se apsolutno isključuju.¹⁷

Prije nego što prijedemo na sam film, moramo znati da je prvi tekst o Situacionističkoj internacionali koji se pojavio na srpskom jeziku objavljen u publikaciji *Film i revolucija* danas koji su uredili Dušan Makavejev i Lazar Stojanović 1971. godine kao materijal za simpozij "Film u društvenim konfrontacijama" organiziran u Beogradu. Publikacija zanimljiva dizajna, pored tekstova Geryja Snydera, Abbieja Hoffmana, Timothyja Learyja, te drugih predstavnika hipijevske psihodelične supkulture, donosi i tekstove o Leni Riefenstahlu, Godardu, o kubanskom eksperimentalnom filmu, o anarho-feminizmu, Mariguelinog urbanoj gerili, o gerilskoj televiziji, Crnim panterama, Andyju Warholu, te prenosi dijelove situacionističkog traktata *O bijedi studentskog života*. Zanimljivo je da ovi tekstovi supkulturne i kontrakulturne lepeze čine takvu šarolikost u svojoj paradoksalnosti da bismo o ovoj publikaciji mogli govoriti kao o nekoj vrsti postmoderne pretpostmodernosti. Jer sama činjenica da čitamo neki haiku Geryja Snydera, opis proširenja svijesti uz pomoć LSD-ja, nešto o transcendentalnoj meditaciji ili nekritički pisan tekst o Andyju Warholu, nakon Mariguele ili nakon

CONTRIBUTIONS
TO A BETTER
APPREHENSION
AND APPRECIATION
OF PLASTIC
JESUS BY LAZAR
STOJANOVIĆ

time of student protests and which remained one of the most important dramatic moments of the entire movement (its original can be seen in *June Movements* by Želimir Žilnik and its reminiscence in *How I've Been Systematically Ruined by Idiots* by Slobodan Šijan), not to forget the fact that the premiere of rock-musical *Hair* in Belgrade practically coincided with the first anniversary of the student demonstrations. "*Hair* is being shown in Belgrade only a month after New York, London, Stockholm, and Munich, and two weeks before its Paris premiere."¹⁴ This euphoric episode continued when the directors of *Hair* joined the rebellious Belgrade caravan of "protest, love, quarrel, and hope" and when the actors staged *Let the Sunshine In* especially for Tito on the occasion of New Year's Eve celebrations at the Youth Centre in 1970. In view of all that, the student movement of 1968 seems like recuperating some revolutionary and rebellious gesture of dissatisfied youth. It is a mock revolution or, as Rastko Močnik has observed with respect to *Early Works*: "It is the end of the revolution before it has even begun."¹⁵ Today it is easy to conclude that the student movement was a fuse for social (and libidinal) dissatisfaction and that the hippie-like "fiction of blameless and pure positivity, of a virgin country beyond all ideology, is politically speaking the most dangerous position."¹⁶ Vasiljević has very con-

vincingly shown the consumerist and populist sides of the student protest and its super-ideology, but makes a rather vague distinction between the two sorts of ideology when he claims: "In case of ex-Yugoslavia, the attempt to find that blind spot of ideology ended in ideological blindness," which means that an ideology which plays the main role in terms of regulation and constitution in the entire system can, at the same time, be some sort of misunderstood path, or even a joke. Unfortunately, as we know, the appropriation of Žižek's hypotheses (especially the one about the "metastasis of *jouissance*") has mostly led to conclusions stained with political cynicism. And we may add all that confusion around the interpretation of 1968, which he has caused by fusing and using in the same context, without any reluctance, the theories of Edgar Morin and Guy Debord, although they are mutually totally exclusive.¹⁷

Before dedicating ourselves to the film as such, we must note that the first text on the Situationist International in Serbian language was published in *Film and Revolution Today*, a collection of materials for the Belgrade symposium on "Film in Social Confrontations," edited by Dušan Makavejev and Lazar Stojanović in 1971. That interestingly designed publication contained texts by Gery Snyder, Abbie Hoffman, Timothy Leary, and other representatives of psychedelic hi-

pamfleta situacionista, predstavlja niz običnih suprotnosti. Gledano na ovaj način, Hoffmann i Warhol služe onome čemu su uvijek i služili, a to je depolitizacija kontrakulture i rekuperacija stvarnog političkog bunta. Citirati *Bijedu studentskog života* u istom kontekstu s Learyjevim psihodelizmom znači zagovarati najkonzervativniju tezu da je Mustapha Khayati sa strasburškim studentima konzumirao velike količine opijata, i ne razumjeti ništa od uvodnih upozorenja *Bijede*, među kojima se kaže da je "student, uz popa i pandura, najprezrenije stvorenje u zemlji Francuskoj".¹⁸ Iako Lazar Stojanović često ističe da su Godard i drugi francuski režiseri mnogo značili njemu i njegovim kolegama, pitanje je koliko su situacionisti imali utjecaja na jugoslavensku kinematografiju i revolucionarno-marksističko mišljenje. Ako se uzme u obzir da je tijekom šezdesetih godina u Jugoslaviji Situacionistička internacionala imala malo odjeka, osim jedne kratke bilješke u *Studentu* 1967. godine o strasburškim situacionistima¹⁹ i "mitske" prepiske između Branka Vučićevića i Guy Deborda, ova najradikalnija skupina 20. stoljeća samo je jedan od primjera *undergrounda* zapadnjačke radikalnosti. Možda je upravo termin "underground" pravi ključ za čitanje gore navedene publikacije koju su Makavejev i Stojanović uredili. "Underground" se pojavljuje u mnogim tekstovima

časopisa *Vidici* i *Student*, u godinama kada je Lazar Stojanović bio aktivan kao urednik. Tamo se "underground" spominje kao novi žanr kritički orijentiranog američkog filma, koji je na najradikalniji način uspio prikazati društvene nepravde i eksploatacije bez ikakvog posredovanja tehnika direktnog filma ili *cinema veritéa*. "Underground"-film, što se uglavnom odnosi na američki film, od avangardnog se filma razlikuje po tome što se ne producira i ne distribuira u okviru neke institucije, te se uglavnom nadovezuje na neku kontrakulturu, koja je tih dana bila hipijevska. "Underground"-film i kultura za Stojanovića su značili prije slobodu izražavanja u tehnici i mediju nego jedan od žanrova nove kinematografije; za njega je "underground" također značio amaterizam, direktnost, nesavršenost, neefikasnost i, naravno, bunt. Jedino tako možemo valjano razumjeti postulate suvremenog filma koje je Stojanović postavio 1968. godine: "Biti redatelj filma danas pretpostavlja prije svega bogatu ličnost i visoku filmsku kulturu, a sve manje savladan zanat rada sa glumcem, montažnog razlaganja zbivanja, pokreta kamere i pripovijedanja uz pomoć slika."²⁰ Ova pohvala amaterizmu, koja se nadovezuje na militantnost samog redatelja, u manje-više apolitičnoj verziji se može primijetiti i u radu Mihovila Pansinija s njegovim GEF-ovima,²¹ čak na samom početku 60-ih godina u Jugoslaviji.

ppie subculture, but also those on Leni Riefenstahl, Godard, experimental Cuban film, anarcho-feminism, Mariguela's urban guerrilla, guerrilla television, Black Panthers, and Andy Warhol, including some segments from the situationist treatise *On the Poverty of Student Life*. It is interesting that these texts from the subcultural and countercultural spectrum made such a colourful and paradoxical combination that we may speak of that publication as an example of postmodern pre-postmodernity. The very fact that we can find there a haiku by Gery Snyder, a description of how to expand one's consciousness with the use of LSD, a thing or two on transcendental meditation, and an uncritical text on Andy Warhol, following Mariguela or a situationist pamphlet, is a series of sheer contradictions. Seen that way, Hoffmann and Warhol served the purpose that they always served, which is the depolitization of counterculture and the recuperation of genuine political protest. To quote the pamphlet *On the Poverty of Student Life* in the same context with Leary's psychedelic musings equals endorsing a most conservative hypothesis that Mustapha Khayati and the Strasbourg students consumed a large quantity of opiates, and misunderstanding completely the introductory observation of the treatise, namely that "the student is the most despised creature in France, apart from the policeman and

the priest."¹⁸ Even though Lazar Stojanović often emphasized that Godard and other French directors had meant a lot to him and his colleagues, it is questionable to what extent the situationists actually influenced Yugoslav cinematography and the revolutionary Marxist thinking. If we take into account that the Situationist International found little echo in Yugoslavia in the 1960s, except for a brief note in *Student* journal in 1967 about the Strasbourg situationists¹⁹ and the "mythical" correspondence between Branko Vučićević and Guy Debord, this group, most radical of all in the 20th century, was only an example of the underground of Western radicalism. Perhaps it is precisely the term "underground" that could serve as the real key for interpreting the above-mentioned publication edited by Makavejev and Stojanović. That "underground" appeared in many texts published in *Vidici* and *Student* at the time when Lazar Stojanović was active as their editor. There it was mentioned as the new genre of critically oriented American film, which managed to present social injustice and exploitation in a most radical way, without any mediation of techniques that were typical of the direct cinema or *cinema verité*. "Underground" film, which usually referred to American film, differed from avant-garde film in that it was not produced or distributed in an institutional framework, but mostly relied on counterculture,

Ali kod Stojanovića i Jovana Jovanovića »underground« znači više od filma, to je i način života i politike koja je sušta suprotnost bilo koje angažirane društvene kritike; to je negiranje bez ikakve dijalektike ili cilja, najelementarniji čin osporavanja! Ovako možemo bolje shvatiti i šezdesetosmašku interpretaciju *Plastičnog Isusa*. To nije film, kao što Pavle Levi shvaća, o humanizmu ljudskog pojedinca i idejama humanitarnih praksisovskih marksista, nego je riječ o jednom asocijalnom tipu, društvenom otpadniku koji se ne želi prilagoditi ili pronaći sebi odgovarajuće mjesto; to je priča o "došljaku koji nema od čega da živi, a živi od žena, ima izrazitu sklonost da tuca sve živo i to je njegov oblik komuniciranja s okolinom".²² Došljaka, ili glavnu ulogu u filmu, glumi Tomislav Gotovac (inače i sam redatelj eksperimentalnih i »underground«-filmova), dok njegova antipoda, lika iz bogate i dobre obitelji koji se pretvara da se druži s podzemnim tipovima, glumi Ljubiša Ristić. Oba lika su možda dovoljna za razumijevanje razlika između humanitarnog marksista i podzemnog anarhista. Ako je Ristić onaj oportunist za kojega je disidentstvo samo svrha boljeg društvenog položaja (a pokazalo se da je to tako), onda je Gotovac ta suprotnost: spreman je žrtvovati i svoju budućnost i karijeru za svoju »umjetnost« (također se pokazalo da je tako). Lako možemo uočiti da je humanizam marksista 60-ih godina na neki način

samo pridonio proširenju teoretske mogućnosti slobodnog kapitala, koja je tek nakon nekoliko desetljeća uspjela naći i svoju ekonomsku i nacionalnu masovnu podršku.²³

3. Politika (ponovno)

Lazar Stojanović je možda jedini filmski režiser *crnog vala* koji je još početkom šezdesetih bio antimarksist – zapravo već od 1966. godine, kada je čitao Karla Poppera, prestao je biti marksist. U jednom razgovoru ovako objašnjava način na koji se razlikuje od drugih režisera: »Makavejev, a možda i Žilnik, rekao bih, su, i to u pozitivnom smislu, u duši marksisti. Oni su neka vrsta komunista, neka vrsta ljudi kojima reč napredak nešto znači«²⁴, a za režisera *Plastičnog Isusa* to nije značilo ništa drugo nego mitologiju i propagandu koju su komunisti nakon Drugog svjetskog rata htjeli samo usavršiti (ili razvodnjavati Goebelsovu praksu). Tu svoju poziciju Stojanović dvadeset godina poslije svog *Plastičnog Isusa* reinterpreтира, nažalost kao liberalnu: »U odnosu na privredu bio sam i ostao sam dosledan liberal (verovao sam u privatizaciju, konkurenciju, javnu odgovornost vlasti za javna dobra i u prvenstvenu vrednost kapitala i kvalitetnog upravljanja oslobođenog od ideologije). U odnosu na kulturu i građanske slobode bio sam anarhist (branio sam prvenstvo lične slobode, neograničene slobode izražavanja, umetničkog stvaranja i

NEKI PRILOZI
ZA BOLJE
RAZUMIJEVANJE
I UŽIVANJE U
FILMU PLASTIČNI
ISUS LAZAR
STOJANOVIĆA

CONTRIBUTIONS
TO A BETTER
APPREHENSION
AND APPRECIATION
OF PLASTIC
JESUS BY LAZAR
STOJANOVIĆ

which was at that time a hippie counterculture. For Stojanović, "underground" film and culture primarily meant freedom of expression in technology and the media, rather than a genre of new cinematography; moreover, "underground" equalled amateurism, directness, imperfection, inefficacy, and – of course – rebellion. It is only in that context that we can appropriately understand the postulates of contemporary film that Stojanović formulated in 1968: "To be a film director today presupposes, above all, having a rich personality and a good knowledge of film, rather than mastering the craft of working with actors, dividing the action into frames, camera movement, or narration with the help of images."²⁰ This praise of amateurism, in combination with a militant attitude of the director, can also be observed, although in a more or less apolitical version, in Mihovil Pansini and his GEFfs,²¹ as early as the very beginning of the 60s. But for Stojanović and Jovan Jovanović, "underground" was more than film; it was also a way of life and politics that was completely opposite to all engaged social criticism; it meant negation without dialectics or specific goals, the most elementary act of opposition! In this way, we can understand better the 68-ish interpretation of *Plastic Jesus*. It is not, as Pavle Levi claims, about the humanism of a human individual and the ideas of humanist Praxis-Marxists, but

about an antisocial character, a social outcast that refuses to adjust himself or find a suitable place for himself; it is the story of a "newcomer that has nothing to live on, so he lives on women, he has an outspoken inclination of shagging everything that moves and that is his way of communicating with his surroundings."²² That newcomer, the main character in the film, is played by Tomislav Gotovac (himself an author of experimental and "underground" films), while his antipode, a man from rich and respectable family, who pretends that he is hanging out with men from the underground, is played by Ljubiša Ristić. These two characters may be sufficient for understanding the difference between a humanist Marxist and an underground anarchist. If Ristić is the kind of opportunist for whom being a dissident is just a way to obtain a better social position (which turns out to be true), then Gotovac is his counterpart: he is ready to sacrifice his future and his career for his "art" (which also turns out to be true). We can easily perceive that the humanism of Marxists in the 60s only helped in expanding the theoretical potential of free capital, which needed a few decades to find its economic and national mass support.²³

3. Politics (again)

Lazar Stojanović may be the only film director of the Black

naučnog istraživanja).«

U prvom "političkom" prilogu za bolje razumijevanje i uživanje u *Plastičnom Isusu* u ovom tekstu upozorenje se odnosilo na nacionalnu apropijaciju slučaja Lazar Stojanović i na kolateralne štete koje bi ovakvo shvaćanje moglo prouzročiti. U ovom, drugom "političkom" prilogu, upozorenje se odnosi na neke od formulacija samog Stojanovića o svom radu, koje bi se izravno mogle čitati kao konzervativne i protukomunističke.

Jedna stvar koju trebamo ozbiljno shvatiti jest to da je studentski pokret 1968. bio više marksistički nego što se to često pretpostavlja. Pored toga što su studenti promijenili ime beogradskog Univerziteta u "Crveni univerzitet Karl Marx", također su se i mnogi transparenti nadovezali na dosljedno provođenje marksističkih ideala. Jedna od najpoznatijih parola bila je: »Naš program je program SKJ. Zahtijevamo dosljedno sprovođenje.«²⁶ Časopis *Student* je u svoja posljednja tri izvanredna broja na naslovnici koristio najveća imena komunizma, prvo Marxa, zatim Lenjina i na koncu samog Tita, zajedno s njihovim historijskim citatima. U to vrijeme Stojanović je bio član Koordinacijskog odbora demonstracija, predvodeći svoj fakultet, a ujedno je bio i urednik časopisa *Student*.

Možda je ovaj diskurs studenata koji su se oslonili na svoga

Plastičnog Isusa – odnosno Tita, Marxa i Lenjina, kao na svojevrsne pokrovitelje svoga bunta, naveo Stojanovića na takav jedan antimarksistički, zapravo čak antititoistički stav. Osim u već spomenutoj sceni s Titom u *Plastičnom Isusu*, Stojanović se još jednom te iste godine pozabavio likom maršala Tita. Kao glavni urednik *Vidika* objavio je broj posvećen kulturi, pravu i politici u Hitlerovom *Trećem Reichu*. »To sam napravio upotrebljavajući (dizajn je takođe moj) velik broj Hitlerovih fotografija. Hitler sa malom decom, Hitler prima cveće, Hitler na poštanskoj marci, Hitler drži govore, itd. Sve su one po žanru i kompoziciji neodoljivo podsećale (a tako su i birane) na fotografije našega tadašnjeg Predsednika. Propagandna mašina bila je ista. Zatim tu je bio jedan Hitlerov tekst gde on kaže, citiram: 'Nemačke sudije ne mogu da svoje pravno postupanje svode na zakon, one moraju prvenstveno da vode računa o interesima nemačke nacije'. Dve godine posle toga, naš je Predsednik održao potpuno analogan govor, tada je rekao da sudije ne treba da se drže zakona kao pijan plota već da treba da vode računa o tome šta su interesi radničke klase.«²⁷ Taj broj (152) *Vidika* je poslije zabranjen, a časopis nije izlazio nekoliko mjeseci. Ovu fascinaciju s desnom, nacističkom ikonografijom, prije pojave *Neue Slowenische Kunst*, Stojanović objašnjava time da je to bilo samo iz

SEZGIN

BOYNIK

Wave who was still anti-Marxist in the early 60s – in fact, it was as early as 1966, when he read Karl Popper, that he ceased to be a Marxist. In an interview, he explained the difference between him and other directors in the following way: "Makavejev, and perhaps Žilnik as well, I would say that they are Marxists in their hearts, and in a positive sense. They are a sort of communists, a sort of people to whom the word *progress* means something";²⁴ for the director of *Plastic Jesus*, it meant nothing else than mythology and propaganda, which communists only sought to perfect after World War II (or to dilute Goebels's practice). That position was reinterpreted by Stojanović twenty years after his *Plastic Jesus*, unfortunately in a liberal version: "With respect to economy, I have always been a consistent liberal (believing in privatization, competition, public responsibility of the state regarding public goods, and the primary value of the capital and good management, free from all ideology). As for the culture and civic freedoms, I have been an anarchist (defending the primacy of personal freedom and the unlimited freedom of expression, artistic creation, and scholarly research)."²⁵ In my first "political" contribution to a better apprehension and appreciation of *Plastic Jesus* in this text, the warning referred to the nationalist appropriation of Lazar Stojanović case and to the collateral damage that such view might

cause. In this second "political" contribution, the warning is about certain formulations uttered by Stojanović himself and about his own work, which may be interpreted directly as conservative and anti-communist.

The one thing that we should take seriously is the fact that the student movement in 1968 was more Marxist than it is commonly supposed. Beside the fact that the students changed the name of the Belgrade university into the "Red University of Karl Marx," many of their billboards were also directly calling for a consistent implementation of Marxist ideals. One of the most famous slogans was: "Our programme is the programme of the Communist Party. We demand its consistent implementation."²⁶ The *Student* journal used the greatest communist names on the cover of its last three thematic issues: first Marx, then Lenin, and eventually Tito himself, along with their historic quotations. At that time, Stojanović was member of the Protest Coordination Committee, representing his university, and he was also the editor of *Student*.

Perhaps it was that discourse of students who relied on their *Plastic Jesus* – that is, on Tito, Marx, and Lenin as a sort of sponsors of the protest, that led Stojanović to adopt such an anti-Marxist and even anti-Titoist position. Apart from the above-mentioned scene with Tito in *Plastic Jesus*, Stojano-

praktičnih razloga, radi boljšega razumijevanja funkcije ideologija, jer prema Stojanoviću: »Nacistička je bolja. Sve to što se u komunizmu radilo poslije Drugog svetskog rata razvodnjavanje je Goebelsa i ništa više.«²⁸ U članku sam nastojao pokazati da je *Plastični Isus* više od političkog kurioziteta; istodobno, malo sam učinio u smislu objašnjavanja o kakvoj je vrsti anarhizma riječ kod Lazara Stojanovića, što bi trebalo značiti biti »anarhist u odnosu na kulturu i građanska prava«, kako je moguće da se pamflet situacionista nalazi na istom *readeru* s tekstom o Warholu, te koje su razlike između psihodelika i *underground*-kontrakulture. Preostaje mi još pojasniti zašto sam toliko tolerantan u svojoj interpretaciji *Plastičnog Isusa*. Stoga završavam pjesmom koju je Stojanović napisao šezdesetih godina:

*Kome prija anarhija?
Šta je čija tragedija?
Ko stanuje ispred metka?
U čemu je zagonetka?*²⁹

¹ Bogdan Tirnanić, *Crni Talas*, Filmski centar Srbije, Beograd, 2008., 144. Tirnanić, koji je i sam aktivno sudjelovao u 'crnom talasu', napisao je velik broj filmskih osvrta i glumio u *Ranim radovima* Želimira Žilnika.

² Bogdan Tirnanić, *Beograd za ponavljače*, Narodna knjiga Alfa, Beograd, 1998., 16. Preciznija definicija koju autor o ovom fenomenu daje jest 'srbijanski turcizam'.

³ Tirnanić na vrlo lukav način rješava ovaj urbani paradoks tako što sam njegov uzrok uspijeva predstaviti kao neki neobjašnjivi simptom: "nema sumnje da Beograd svakim danom sve više propada u svakom pogledu. Drukčije i ne može biti: rat je četiri godine bio udaljen svega stotinjak kilometara". Nav. djelo, 8.

⁴ Milan Nikodijević, *Zabranjeni bez zabrane*, 42. U istoj knjizi u razgovoru s Aleksandrom Petrovićem bavi se temom 'crnog talasa' kao crne ovce.

⁵ Jasna Dragović-Soso, *Spasioci nacije: Intelektualno opozicija Srbije i oživljavanje nacionalizma*, prev. Ljiljana Nikolić, Edicija REC, Beograd, 2004, 57.

⁶ Ibid, 83. Ovdje Soso radi dvije greške, prvo smanjujući Stojanovićevu zatvorsku kaznu na pola, a drugo citirajući navodni opis po kojem se film bavi "vrijednostima" ideologija, po čemu bi na žalost *Plastičnog Isusa* trebalo čitati kao humanistički film.

⁷ Milica Lučić Čavić, *Duhovni Vukovar*: Lazar Stojanović o filmu *Srpska epika*. 17. 4. 1994. U istom razgovoru Stojanović kaže: "Kad bih imao prilike da u Beogradu snimim film o ratu, bio bih veoma srećan, jer ovaj grad je u ratu, a da toga nije svestan."

⁸ Bora Ćosić, *Sodoma i Gomora*, Nolit, Beograd, 1984., 185.

⁹ Milan Nikodijević, *Zabranjeni Bez Zabrane*, 84. U nastavku istog razgovora dodaje: "Nešto što ljudi često ne razumeju jeste da nema nikakve korelacije između kvaliteta filma i činjenice da je on bio politički nepoželjan."

¹⁰ Boris Buden, "Behind the Velvet Curtain – Remembering Dušan Makavejev's W.R.: Mysteries of the Organism", *Afterall*, 18, 2008. Kao što je Stojanović rekao u jednom razgovoru, da država nije zabranila ove filmove, nitko ne bi ni čuo za njih.

¹¹ Pavle Levi, *Disintegration in Frames: Aesthetic and Ideology in Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema*, Stanford University Press, 2007. Ovaj humanitarizam razlikovao se u stupnju sofisticiranosti oko toga da li su

vić took up the figure of Marshall Tito once more that year. As the chief editor of *Vidici*, he published an issue dedicated to culture, law, and politics in Hitler's Third Reich. "I used a large number of Hitler's photographs (the design of the issue was also mine). Hitler with small children, Hitler receives flowers, Hitler on a postal stamp, Hitler holding speeches, etc. In their genre and composition, all these photographs were irresistibly reminiscent (which is how they were selected) of those showing our President. The propaganda machinery was the same. Then there was that statement of Hitler's, I quote: 'German judges cannot reduce their legal proceedings to law; they must primarily take into account the interests of our German nation'. Two years later, our President held a completely analogous speech, saying that judges need not stick to the law blindly, but rather take into account the interests of the working class."²⁷ That issue (152) *Vidici* was later banned and the journal itself suspended for a few months. Stojanović explained that fascination with the rightist, Nazi iconography before the appearance of *Neue Slowenische Kunst* by stating that it had purely practical reasons, since it facilitated the understanding of the function of ideologies, since according to him, "the Nazi ideology was better. All that was done in communism after World War II was merely diluting Goebels and nothing more."²⁸

The aim of this article was to demonstrate that *Plastic Jesus* is more than a political curiosity; at the same time, I have made a modest attempt at explaining what anarchism was for Lazar Stojanović, what it meant to be an "anarchist with respect to culture and civic rights," how it was possible that a situationist pamphlet should end up in the same reader with a text on Warhol, and what were the differences between the psychedelics and an underground counterculture. What remains is to clarify why I should be so tolerant in my interpretation of *Plastic Jesus*. Therefore, I conclude with a poem that Stojanović wrote in the 60s:

*Who likes the anarchy?
What is whose tragedy?
Who lives facing the bullet?
What is the riddle?*²⁹

¹ Bogdan Tirnanić, *Crni Talas* [The Black Wave] (Belgrade: Serbian Film Centre, 2008), p. 144. Tirnanić was himself an active participant in the Black Wave, wrote a number of film reviews, and acted in Želimir Žilnik's *Early Works*.

² Bogdan Tirnanić, *Beograd za ponavljače* [Belgrade for slow learners] (Belgrade: Narodna knjiga Alfa, 1998), p. 16. A more precise definition of the phenomenon by the same author is 'Serbian Turkism'.

³ Tirnanić solved that urban paradox in a very clever way, presenting its

teorijski zastupljeni Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse ili Wilhelm Reich.

¹² Snežana Ristić i Radonja Leposavić, "Blato, prašina, život: razgovor sa Dušanom Makavejevim", *Arkzin*, 4, 12. 1997./1.1998. On, kao i Žilnik, na mnogim je mjestima naveo kako je Tito gledao njihove filmove i nakon nekoliko minuta nervozno napustio salu.

¹³ Branislav Jakovljević, "Ljudski je uživati, zar ne?", Jun 1968, 'Kosa' i početak kraja Jugoslavije", *Reč*, Beograd, 2007., 107.

¹⁴ Ibid., 109. *Kosa* kao i drugi *mainstream* hipi-mitologije igrali su veliku ulogu u alternativni jugoslavenskih 60-ih i 70-ih. Tirnanić piše da je Woodstock za njega bio simbol bunta šezdesetih, pa je krajnji čas zapitati se koje su veze između blata u Woodstocku i u *Ranim radovima*?

¹⁵ Rastko Močnik, "Tri pogleda na koketiranje s revolucijom", *Rok*, 3, 10/1969., 90.

¹⁶ Vasiljević, op.cit., 114.

¹⁷ Za situacionističku, 'predšezdesetosmašku' interpretaciju Morina i njihovo 'predskazanje' 1968. čitajte "Bedu studentskog života", *Blok 45*, Beograd, 2004.

¹⁸ "Beda studentskog života", 13.

¹⁹ Kao što se zna, nikad nisu postojali 'strasburški situacionisti'. Autor teksta Milan Bunjevac ne samo da ih izmišlja, nego ih opisuje kao: "mahom studenti ekonomije i političkih nauka, situacionisti imaju uglavnom solidno obrazovanje...i da su u teorijskom i praktičnom čorsokaku". *Student*, br. 10, 28. 3. 1967., 8.

²⁰ Lazar Stojanović, "Osnovi savremenog filma", *Student*, br. 13, 9. 4. 1968., 12.

²¹ *Genre Film Festival* pokrenut je 1963. godine (op. ur.).

²² Nebojša Pajkić i Saša Radojević, "Oženjen ili mrtav - Razgovor sa Lazar Stojanovićem", *Novi ritam*, br. 4/5, 1-2, 1991., 55.

²³ Vrijedan, ali ne tako razrađen prilog ovoj diskusiji bio je tekst Vladimira Markovića, "Dissident Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism", *Prelom*, br. 8. Za kritiku Levijeve teorije humanističkog marksizma pogledati osvrt Primoža Krasoveca na knjigu Pavla Levija, "Pavle Levi: Disintegration in Frames – plameni sprave", *Kino!*, no.4/2008, Ljubljana.

²⁴ N. Pajkić i S. Radojević, nav. djelo, 54.

²⁵ Lazar Stojanović, "Ko behu disidenti", *Republika*, 182, veljača 1998.

²⁶ U posebnom izdanju *Vidika* od 5. 6. 1968. mogu se naći sve te parole.

Zanimljivo je da se u istom broju može čitati članak Slavka Lebedinskija *Nezaposlenost* – to bi možda bila jedna nit koja je vezivala protagoniste 1968. s režiserima *crnog vala* koji su bili jedini koji su se otvoreno bavili tom 'mračnom socijalnom temom' socijalističke Jugoslavije.

²⁷ Mirjana Milosavljević, "Antititoist iz drugog filma – intervju s Lazarom Stojanovićem", *Start*, Zagreb, 546/23. 12. 1989., 53.

²⁸ N. Pajkić i S. Radojević, nav. djelo, 55. Radi se o onome što Guy Debord u svojim "Komentarima" za *Društvo spektakla* naziva 'difuznim spektaklom'.

²⁹ Lazar Stojanović, Milan Majstorović, *Biće bolje*, Chronos, Titograd, 1972.

source as some sort of inexplicable symptom: "There is no doubt that Belgrade is deteriorating every day and in every sense. And that is hardly surprising: for four years, the war was only a hundred kilometres away". Op. cit., p. 8.

⁴ Milan Nikodijević, *Zabranjeni bez zabrane* [Banned without a ban], p. 42. In the same book, in an interview with Aleksandar Petrović, he referred to the 'Black Wave' as a black sheep.

⁵ Jasna Dragović-Soso, *Saviours of the Nation: Serbia's Intellectual Opposition and the Revival of Nationalism* (Belgrade: Montreal: McGill Queens University Press, 2002).

⁶ Ibidem. Soso makes two mistakes here: firstly, she reduces Stojanović's prison sentence to a half, and secondly, by quoting an alleged description in which the film dealt with the "values" of ideologies, whereby *Plastic Jesus* should unfortunately be interpreted as a humanist film.

⁷ Milica Lučić Čavić, *Duhovni Vukovar* [Spiritual Vukovar]: Lazar Stojanović on the film Srpska epika [Serbian epic], 17 April 1994. In the same interview, Stojanović said: "If I had a chance to make a war film in Belgrade, I would be very glad, for this city is engaged in a war without knowing it."

⁸ Bora Ćosić, *Sodoma i Gomora* [Sodom and Gomorrah] (Belgrade: Nolit, 1984), p. 185.

⁹ Milan Nikodijević, op. cit., p. 84. In the same interview, he added: "Something that people often fail to understand is that there is no correlation between the quality of a film and the fact that he was politically a persona non grata."

¹⁰ Boris Buden, "Behind the Velvet Curtain – Remembering Dušan Makavejev's W.R.: Mysteries of the Organism", *Afterall* 18 (Summer 2008).

As Stojanović stated in an interview, had the state not banned those films, no one would have even heard of them.

¹¹ Pavle Levi, *Disintegration in Frames: Aesthetic and Ideology in Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema* (Stanford University Press, 2007). That humanism differed in its degree of sophistication as to its theoretical references to Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, or Wilhelm Reich.

¹² Snežana Ristić i Radonja Leposavić, "Blato, prašina, život: razgovor sa Dušanom Makavejevim" [Mud, dust, and life: An interview with Dušan Makavejev], *Arkzin* 4 (Dec. 1997 / Jan 1998). Just like Žilnik, he mentioned several times that Tito had seen their films and regularly abandoned the theatre hall nervously after a couple of minutes.

¹³ Branislav Jakovljević, "Ljudski je uživati, zar ne?", Jun 1968, 'Kosa' i početak kraja Jugoslavije" [It is human to have fun, isn't it? June 1968, the 'Hair', and the beginning of the fall of Yugoslavia], *Reč* (Belgrade, 2007), p. 107.

¹⁴ Ibid., 109. *Hair* and other elements of mainstream hippie-mythology played a crucial role in Yugoslav alternative movements of the 60s and 70s. Tirnanić has written that for him, Woodstock was the symbol of the 60s rebellion and it is high time to ask: What is the link between mud in Woodstock and mud in his *Early Works*?

¹⁵ Rastko Močnik, "Tri pogleda na koketiranje s revolucijom" [Three views on flirting with the revolution], *Rok* 3 (Oct. 1969), p. 90.

¹⁶ Vasiljević, op.cit., p. 114.

¹⁷ For the situationist, pre-68ish interpretation of Morin, and their 'prophecy' of 1968, see their "On the Poverty of Student Life," available at <http://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/poverty.html>.

¹⁸ Ibidem.

¹⁹ It is well known that there was no such a thing as the 'Strasbourg situationists'. The author of the text, Milan Bunjevac, not only invented them, but also described them as "chiefly students of economics and political sciences, since most situationists have a solid education... but are both theoretically and practically stuck in a cul-de-sac." *Student* 10 (28 March 1967), p. 8.

²⁰ Lazar Stojanović, "Osnovi savremenog filma" [The basics of contemporary film], *Student* 13 (9 April 1968), p. 12.

²¹ *Genre Film Festival* was launched in 1963 (editor's note).

²² Nebojša Pajkić i Saša Radojević, "Oženjen ili mrtav - Razgovor sa Lazar Stojanovićem" [Married or dead: An interview with Lazar Stojanović], *Novi ritam* 4/5, 1-2 (1991), p. 55.

²³ A valuable, even though rather unelaborated contribution to the

NEKI PRILOZI
ZA BOLJE
RAZUMIJEVANJE
I UŽIVANJE U
FILMU PLASTIČNI
ISUS LAZARA
STOJANOVIĆA

CONTRIBUTIONS
TO A BETTER
APPREHENSION
AND APPRECIATION
OF PLASTIC
JESUS BY LAZAR
STOJANOVIĆ

debate was that of Vladimir Marković, "Dissident Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism," *Prelom* 8. For a criticism of Levi's theory of humanist Marxism, see Primož Krasovec's review of Levi's book, "Pavle Levi: Disintegration in Frames – plameni sprave", *Kino!* 4 (2008).

²⁴ N. Pajkić and S. Radojević, op. cit., p. 54.

²⁵ Lazar Stojanović, "Ko behu disidenti" [Who were the dissidents], *Republika* 182 (Feb. 1998).

²⁶ One can find all these slogans in the special issue of Vidici from 5 June 1968. It is interesting to note that the same issue contains an article by Slavko Lebedinski entitled *Nezaposlenost* [Unemployment] – which might be a link between the protagonists of 1968 with the film directors of the Black Wave, since these were the only ones who dealt with that 'dark social topic' of socialist Yugoslavia.

²⁷ Mirjana Milosavljević, "Antititoist iz drugog filma – intervju s Lazarom Stojanovićem" [The anti-Titoist from a different film: An interview with Lazar Stojanović], *Start* 546/23 (Dec. 1989), p. 53.

²⁸ N. Pajkić and S. Radojević, op. cit., p. 55. That is what Guy Debord has termed a 'diffuse spectacle' in his commentaries to the *Society of the Spectacle*.

²⁹ Lazar Stojanović, Milan Majstorović, *Biće bolje* [It will get better] (Titograd: Chronos, 1972).

